



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sophonisba contains but few of them, and its French translation by Mellin de St. Gelais, though more poetic in this respect, offers but three possible likenesses to its later rival. In the same way Rivaudeau's *Aman* (1560) seems to have exercised no influence over Montchrestien's tragedy of the same name; nor did the Bible, from which was drawn the material for this play and also for the tragedy of *David*, contribute to them any figures of speech. This statement is also true of Plutarch and Livy, who supplied the subject for Montchrestien's *Lacènes* and *Sophonisbe* respectively. The French playwright appears entirely independent of them all, saving for the substance of his plots. Singularly enough Scholl makes no allusion whatever to Seneca's tragedies, so prolific in rhetorical phrases and figures of speech. Inasmuch as this Latin writer was the guide and model for all Renaissance tragedy, and was faithfully followed by Garnier in plot and expression, the silence of our author regarding his possible influence on Montchrestien is somewhat unexpected.

After having answered these leading questions, Scholl takes up the subordinate one of the difference between the two editions of Montchrestien's works, which were published in 1601 and again in 1603. He finds that the plays which appeared in both editions have been worked over in the second, and so decidedly transformed that the revision would seem to have been made from memory and not after the original text.

The fondness of his dramatist for figures of speech reminds Scholl of Homer's style, and suggests to him to add to the epithet of "lyric" and "dramatic" the further and more characteristic one of "epic," as illustrative of Montchrestien's manner. Was he more "epic" than Seneca who patterned his tragedies so closely on the great tragic writers of Greece? Our critic perhaps did not ask himself this question. But he affirms that Montchrestien is superior to the tragic writers of France, in this matter of comparisons and similes, and that the fashionable language of the court under the two Louis, and the development of the dramatic element, circumscribed most rigorously the freedom of Corneille and Racine. Surely the play intended for the spec-

tator must have demanded a greater amount of action and happenings than the poem written for the reader. Lyric effusions and imaginative periods would appeal but occasionally to the restless occupants of the pit, and so it was that free simile yielded to hampered metaphor with the popular playwrights of the seventeenth century.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

OLD ENGLISH.

A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for the Use of Students. By JOHN R. CLARK HALL, M. A., Ph. D. Sm. 4to, pp. xvi., 369. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894.

DURING the past twenty years, no need has been more strongly felt among students of the English language than a dictionary of Old English, which should approach completeness. Many excellent vocabularies and glossaries have appeared, dealing with a few texts; but, with the exception of the great 'Sprachschatz' of Grein (1861-64), we have no really scientific work covering the whole alphabet, and based on a considerable number of texts.

Dr. Hall has produced a dictionary embracing all the words, with the exception of proper names and some rare words from the glosses, contained in the various lexical works which have appeared up to date, and has added to these a number of words from unglossaried texts, though, as yet, this work has not been done exhaustively. He claims to have thus introduced more than two thousand words which are not found in Bosworth-Toller, so far as it has been issued.

Among the most important features of the book are the following:

1. The arrangement is strictly alphabetical, with *ð* treated as a separate letter, after *z*.
2. The only diacritical mark used is the macron. The long diphthongs have the macron over the first vowel. This is the only large dictionary in which the mark is correctly placed.
3. The standard of spelling is the Early West-Saxon, with Cosijn as ultimate authority. But here Hall differs from his predecessors in that he inserts only forms which actually

occur. Thus, if a word is not found in the Early West-Saxon manuscripts, the Late West-Saxon form is given, and if this is wanting, recourse is had to a dialectic form. To complete the confusion, Dr. Hall goes on to say, 'this plan has not always been adhered to.' He has sought to exclude all normalizations, but cannot hope to have succeeded, 'as they swarm in some of the glossaries on which the dictionary is founded.'

This is, without doubt, the feature of the book which will be most often called in question. The author offers, in defence of his course, the following arguments:

(a). Normalization is common in glossaries, and this new arrangement will give the student 'another string to his bow.'

(b). By taking a spelling which really occurs, and, of a number of actual forms, the most common one, the necessity of looking in two or more places for a word is in large measure obviated.

(c). To help to 'counteract the drawbacks' of his plan, all the variants of the root-vowel of simple words have been placed in parentheses against the head-form; the student is thus enabled to find all the compounds, no matter what their vowel may be.

Undoubtedly, Dr. Hall's plan has aided him in condensing the work into 369 pages—an end, by the way, which seems to have been continually kept in view; and its practical value, in many instances, cannot be denied. But it gives to his pages an utterly unscientific and confused appearance, and greatly lessens the value of the book for any other purpose than that which, after all, is of prime importance,—to serve as a means of translating Old English.

Two examples of this confusion may suffice: on page 81, we have *egsa*, *ēgsa*=*egesa*, *ēgesa*. These words, *egsa* and *ēgsa*, are not as would appear, equivalent forms, but come from entirely separate roots: *egsa*, from *ege*, 'terror'; *ēgsa*, from a root kindred to that of *āgan*, 'to own.' On page 197, appear *læt̥tēow*=*lāt̥tēow*. *læt̥tēwestre*, sf. 'guide, conductress.' *Æ*. [*lāt̥tēow*.] These are precisely parallel words; but, no account of the greater frequency of occurrence of one or the other form, this ridiculous separation of them has been made.

4. All words occurring in the Alfredian manuscripts have been marked A O. (*Orosius*), C P. (*Cura Pastoralis*), or Chr. (*Chronicle*), as the case may be.

The forms which appear in Ælfric are often marked *Æ*; many of those confined to the poetry are designated by a dagger, and some dialectic forms are denoted by N, M, A, or K. But this marking is confessedly incomplete.

5. Numerous references are made to Cook's translation of Sievers's *Grammar*, and to the Grammatical Introduction to Sweet's *Reader*. These are quite full and must be very helpful to the student. They explain points of both phonology and inflection.

6. An unusually large number of cross-references are given. All the parts of strong verbs which differ from the infinitive, and occasional peculiar case-forms of nouns and pronouns, are inserted separately. This will be a great boon to the elementary student. Many, though not all, variations of spelling have been noted. Sometimes this seems superfluous; as (p. 81), *ēgland* and *ēglond*, both referring to *igland*. Again a perplexing form is omitted, as *geunrōtīan* (= *geunrōtsian*) *Ælfc.* Hgl. 4, 295; *underfæncge* (= *underfeng*), Hgl. 12, 46.

7. Four tables are given at the beginning of the book, which are expected to compensate for any shortcomings farther on. These contain, respectively, the vowel sounds in stressed syllables in the various dialects: normalizations used in the dictionary, with the forms which they replace (as *be-*, for *bi-*, *big-*); the ablaut-series of the various classes of strong verbs, in Germanic, Gothic, Icelandic, and Old English; and an index to the ablaut and umlaut vowels found in the parts (other than the four principal ones; e. g., 3rd person singular, present indicative) of strong verbs.

The chief faults of the book, other than those already pointed out, are

1. No compound words are divided into their elements; all words are printed without any division into syllables. And yet prefixes and other initial components are often entered separately.

2. No derivations are given. Occasion-

ally, some etymologically connected form is added in parenthesis, but without a word to explain its relation to the form under definition. It may be the Old English root-word, another word from the same root, or a cognate in one of the other Germanic languages. In the selection of these cognates, moreover, no system has been followed; any word which chanced to occur to the writer has apparently been set down. Modern English forms, which would be of great interest and assistance to the student, are very rare. When the translation is the modern form of the same word, the fact is not made known by any change in the type, or other visible sign.

3. No references to texts are given, other than the general ones to Alfred and Ælfric, mentioned above, except in the case of words which occur only once, or have never before been included in a dictionary.

However, these faults are of minor importance. The book is, on the whole, a very useful one, especially since the larger and more scientific Bosworth-Toller *Dictionary* is still incomplete. It contains many more words than any other work of the sort; the definitions are very concise, but excellent; and the book will supply a need which has been deeply felt on both sides of the Atlantic. It is to the elementary student for whose use it was especially prepared, that it will be of the greatest service.

Until the appearance of something better, we can recommend Dr. Hall's book as the most complete and generally handy Dictionary of Old English for elementary use.

FRANK H. CHASE.

Yale University.

ICELANDIC GRAMMAR.

Beyging Sterkra Sagnorða í Íslensku. JÓN THORKESSON hefir samið. Reykjavík: 1888-94. pp. xii + vii + 576. 8°.

THE present book, a reference collection of the inflectional forms of strong verbs in old and new Icelandic, is one of the most important contributions, on account of its breadth and reliability, that has yet been made to the detailed history of the Icelandic language. Its plan is to give all verbal forms with reference

citation, first in the older language, that is Old Norse, and then in recent Icelandic. References for the older period are collected, where possible, from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and where they are not at hand from the fifteenth century, not only from Icelandic, but from Norwegian sources. For the later period, the majority of forms are taken from the nineteenth century. The list of sources includes more than two hundred titles.

The strong verbs have persisted in Icelandic in a remarkable degree. Of one hundred and ninety-nine verbs in Old Norse (not counting verbs like *gnáa*, *snúa*, *gróa*, *róa*, *ljá* (*læa*), *tjá*), no less than one hundred and sixty-six have come down in a strong form to new Icelandic, although some of them; e. g., *geyja*, *gnesta*, *hnjósa*, *slyngva*, *sperna* are notably defective. Six verbs; viz., *bjarga*, *fregna*, *spýja*, *tyggja*, *verpa*, *þvá*, have in the present language in part strong and weak forms. Fifteen verbs have gone bodily over to the weak conjugation; they are: *blanda*, *blikja*, *blóta*, *falda*, *feta*, *freta*, *gala*, *gnaga* (N. I. also *naga*), *hjálpa*, *hnjóða*, *mala*, *rista*, *skeppja*, *prýngva* (N. I. *þrengja*, *þröngva*). *Blanda*, however, has both strong and weak forms in the p.p.; *rista* has sometimes a strong pret. and p. p., as has also *rita*; *þröngva* has a strong p.p. as adj; *blikja*, *gala*, *hjálpa*, *mala*, *skeppja* have strong forms in poetry. *Klá* has been replaced by the weak verb *klóra* in the same signification. Ten verbs have no forms given in New Icelandic; they are: *bella*, *físa*, *gnella*, *hnyggja*, *hnöggva*, *hrjósa*, *serða*, *síða*, *sníva* (*snýja*), *svipa*. All, with the single exception of *síða*, are notably defective in Old Norse.

The list of strong verbs in New Icelandic, on the other hand, exhibits gains over that of Old Norse in several instances. *Kvíða*, which is throughout weak in Old Norse, is weak in New Icelandic in the present but strong in the past tenses. *Svíða* in Old Norse as transitive is strong, as intransitive, however, it is weak; in new Icelandic it is strong in both uses. Three verbs, no forms of which are cited from Old Norse, have in New Icelandic a strong conjugation; they are: *hnjóta*—*hnaut*—*hnjotið*, *klípa*—*kleip*—*klípin*, *smella*—*small*—*smollinn*, the last one of which has